

The Gazette of India



EXTRAORDINARY

PART II—Section 3

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 155] NEW DELHI, THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1955

ELECTION COMMISSION, INDIA

NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 26th April 1955

S.R.O. 1071.—Whereas the election of Shrimati Manmohan Kaur, as a member of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Patiala and East Punjab States Union, from the Patiala City constituency of that Assembly, has been called in question by an Election Petition duly presented under Part VI of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (XLIII of 1951), by Shri Gurdial Singh, S/o S. Bachittar Singh, Patiala;

And whereas, the Election Tribunal appointed by the Election Commission, in pursuance of the provisions of Section 86 of the said Act, for the trial of the said Election Petition has, in pursuance of the provisions contained in section 103 of the said Act, sent a copy of its Order to the Commission;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of Section 106 of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby publishes the said Order of the Tribunal.

BEFORE THE ELECTION TRIBUNAL, PATIALA

Nawal Kishore—Chairman.

Dalip Singh.—Member.

Krishna Sahai—Member.

ELECTION PETITION NO. 7 OF 1954.

S. Gurdial Singh son of S. Bachittar Singh of Patiala.—Petitioner.

Versus

1. Shrimati Manmohan Kaur wife of S. Gian Singh Rarewala of Patiala.
2. Shri Sham Lal son of Shri Nihal Chand of Patiala Chatta Nanu Mal.
3. Shri Puran Chand son of Shri Kanshi Ram Advocate, Patiala.
4. S. Jaswant Singh son of S. Bishan Singh, Dugal Villa, Patiala.
5. S. Bhagat Singh son of S. Sunder Singh, Dharmpura Road, Patiala.
6. B. Som Parkash son of L. Labh Chand, Moranwali Street, Patiala.
7. Shri Siri Chand son of Kanshi Ram, Anardana Chowk, Patiala.
8. S. Teja Singh son of S. Sunder Singh, 8 Barandari Garden, at present c/o Additional District Judge, New Delhi.
9. S. Hari Singh son of S. Narain Singh of Patiala.
10. Shri Dial Singh son of Manni Singh, Adalat Bazar, Patiala.

11. S. Sohinder Singh son of Mool Singh, Anardana Chowk, Patiala.
12. S. Hari Singh son of S. Karam Singh, Patiala.
13. S. Gian Singh, Yadavindra Bhawan, Patiala.
14. Shri Shiam Lall son of Nand Lal A. Tank, Patiala.
15. S. Dewan Singh son of Murli Singh, Patiala.
16. L. Amar Nath son of L. Nanak Chand, Dharmpura Road, Patiala.—*Respondents.*

ORDER DELIVERED ON 16TH OF APRIL, 1955

This is election petition No. 7 of 1954 and has been filed by S. Gurdial Singh challenging the election of Respondent No. 1, Shrimati Manmohan Kaur from the Patiala Constituency. The petitioner along with Respondents 1, 2 and 16 with whom alone we are concerned in this petition contested the election to the PEPSU Legislative Assembly held in February, 1954 from the Patiala City Constituency. The nomination papers were filed by these candidates before the Returning Officer on 9th January 1954. The petitioner's allegation in paragraphs 3 and 5 is that his nomination was illegally rejected by the latter on the ground that the acceptance of the election agent in Form 5(A) had not been attached by him with the nomination paper and further that his request to grant him time to produce his election agent, who had already filled Form 5(A) in token of his acceptance as such and was outside the Court room of the Returning Officer was not acceded to. It was further alleged that the action of the Returning Officer was illegal, malicious, *ultra vires* and without jurisdiction. As regards respondents 2 and 16, it was generally alleged in paragraphs 9 and 10 that their nomination papers had also been rejected on the same ground. The petitioner accordingly alleged in paragraphs 6, 7 and 11 that Form 5(A) was not at all necessary to be filed along with the nomination paper and that the failure to attach the acceptance in Form 5(A) was a technical defect and not one of substantial character and that the order of the Returning Officer rejecting the nomination papers had materially affected the result of election.

The result of the order passed by the Returning Officer was that the petitioner and the respondents No. 2 and 16 could not contest the election with Respondent No. 1 Shrimati Manmohan Kaur who polled the largest number of votes. The petitioner has accordingly prayed that it may be declared that the election of respondent 1 was wholly void.

Respondent No. 1, the contesting respondent, pleaded that the nomination papers had been rightly rejected, as besides the fact that the acceptance of the election agent in Form 5(A) had not been attached with the nomination papers, as a matter of fact there was no acceptance by the election agent at all. The election agent was not present and a request for the grant of time to produce him had not been made. The absence of the acceptance in Form 5(A) was alleged to be a defect of a substantial character and fatal to the nomination and it was pleaded further that the order passed by the Returning Officer was neither illegal nor malicious and had not materially affected the result of the election as the petitioner and respondents 2 and 16 were only dummy candidates.

On the above pleadings the following seven issues were framed:—

- (1) Whether the election agents of the petitioner and Shri Sham Lal had accepted their appointments as their election agents? O. P.
- (2) Whether it was incumbent on the Returning Officer to grant time to the petitioner at the time of the scrutiny to produce the acceptance by his agent in Form 5(A)?
 - (b) If so, was time not granted and what is its effect in law? O. P.
- (3) Whether the rejection of the nomination paper of the petitioner on the ground that he had not delivered the acceptance of his agent in Form 5(A) along with his nomination paper was illegal, improper and had materially affected the result of election? O. P.
- (4) Whether rejection of the nomination papers of respondent No. 2, Sham Lal and respondent No. 16, Shri Amar Nath, on the ground mentioned in issue No. 3 was illegal and improper and had materially affected the election? O. P.
- (5) Whether the failure to file the acceptance of the election agents with the nomination paper was merely a technical defect and not one of substantial character? O. P.
- (6) Whether the order of rejection passed by the Returning Officer was malicious, *ultra vires* and without jurisdiction? O. P.
- (7) Relief.

The law concerning the above issues is contained in Sections 33, 36 and 40 of Act 43 of 1951 and Rule 11 A of the Rules framed under the Act and may be briefly recapitulated as below —

- (a) That every candidate must deliver to the Returning Officer a nomination paper completed in the prescribed form and subscribed by the candidate himself assenting to the nomination and by the proposer and seconder [S. 33(1)]
- (b) That every nomination paper so delivered shall be accompanied by a declaration in writing by the candidate of the appointment of the election agent any by such other declaration, if any, as may be prescribed. [S. 33(3)]
- (c) That every nominated candidate shall appoint his election agent before the delivery of the nomination paper and obtain his acceptance in writing in Form 5(A). [S. 40(1 and 2) and Rule 11A.]
- (d) That the nomination paper shall be rejected for failure to comply with the provisions of Section 33 of the Act, provided the defect on account of which the nomination paper is rejected is not technical but a substantial one. [S. 36(2d. and 4)].

The petitioner delivered his nomination paper Ex. PW1/3 to the Returning Officer on 9th January 1954. It also bore 9th January 1954 as the date and contained at the bottom, his assent to the nomination and also a declaration of the appointment of Sher Singh as his election agent. The nomination paper was, however, not accompanied by the acceptance of the election agent in Form 5(A). It has now been produced by the petitioner and is Ex. Pl on the record, bearing 8th January 1954 as the date. Its non-production before the Returning Officer along with the nomination paper raises the important question, *vis a vis* the pleadings of the parties and the law referred to above, whether the election agent had in fact accepted his appointment and executed his acceptance in Form 5(A) before the delivery of the nomination paper Ex PW1/3, on 9th January 1954.

The above is the subject matter of issue No. 1 but since it is a pure question of fact, before dealing with it, it would be appropriate to make a few necessary observations concerning the law. The election law attaches considerable importance to the institution of an election agent who must be selected with care and appointed in writing to make all necessary preparations for conducting the election. In the words of Rogers on Elections, Vol II, Chapter V, the object is that the affairs of the election should be carried on in the light of the day and that a respectable and a responsible man, responsible to the candidate and to the public, should be there to do all that is necessary. That is why S. 40 of the Act and Rule 11 A framed thereunder insist that the appointment of the agent must be made in writing in Form 5(A) before the delivery of the nomination paper. This necessarily implies that the agreement or acceptance of the election agent should be obtained before his appointment, for as observed in 1954 Rajasthan 204, he is clothed with a certain status and enjoys certain privileges and is liable to certain disabilities and it would be unjust to saddle him with such responsibility without his agreeing to become an election agent. The appointment, in other words, is not a unilateral act, in as much as it is not open to a candidate to decide in his own mind who shall be his election agent and after such decision, declare his appointment. It is really speaking a bilateral act, a matter of agreement between the candidate and the agent and therefore unless his assent has been obtained in writing, as required by law, it is no appointment at all. Accordingly any declaration made before the appointment would fall short of the declaration contemplated by Section 33(3) of the Act and is in fact no declaration at all. Further it may be pointed out that the declaration contemplated by this provision of the Act is a genuine and not a sham declaration and it is the duty of the Returning Officer under Section 36(2) to satisfy himself that it is what it purports to be. According to "Parliamentary Elections by Schofield, 1950 ED., page 162", the Returning Officer is under an obligation to perform two duties, namely:

Firstly, he must decide for himself whether a candidate is validly nominated; and

Secondly, he must deal with and dispose of all objections to the nominations.

In case no objection is raised by any of the candidates as may sometimes be on account of a tacit understanding between them, he must *suo moto* satisfy himself that all conditions necessary for the validity of nominations have been complied with. Section 36(2) of the Act clothes him with the power to conduct a summary enquiry into all matters which may arise at his own instance or on behalf of the candidates. Accordingly it is open to him to call upon the candidates to produce Form 5(A) if it is not already there and thereby assure himself of the existence of Form 5(A). We are holding elsewhere in this judgment that the election

L4

law does not require that Form 5(A) should accompany the nomination paper, but we wish to point out that it is always desirable that it should, as that will obviate the necessity of a summary enquiry in every case and hasten the disposal of the nominations. If Form 5(A) is not produced when the candidate is required to do so or if produced and it is found that it did not come into existence before the delivery of the nomination paper, the Returning Officer will be fully justified in coming to the conclusion that not only Section 40, but also Section 33(3) of the Act had not been complied with, as it must then be held that the declaration of appointment was no declaration at all in the eye of the law. He will then have no alternative but to reject the nomination paper under Section 36(2) on the ground that the candidate had failed to comply with the provisions of Section 33 of the Act.

The above view appears to us to be inevitable on a close and careful scrutiny of Sections 33, 36 and 40 of the Act, though it does not seem to have arisen so pointedly in any reported case as none has been cited. 6 E. L. R. 247 is the only authority cited by the learned counsel for the respondent, but occasion for a discussion or decision on this point did not arise, as on the objection of the respondent that Form 5(A) was not in existence at all, it was found that it had been executed before the delivery of the nomination paper. It has been vehemently urged by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the question whether the declaration contained in the nomination paper regarding the appointment of the election agent was not a correct, proper or valid declaration in law and therefore, the nomination paper was liable to be rejected for this reason should not be gone into, as it had not been raised in the written statement. We have given a careful consideration to this contention and are of the view that it is altogether without force. It is a fundamental principle of civil law that the parties should only state the facts on which they rely for their claim or defence and should not plead conclusions of law or of mixed law and fact, for it is for the court to declare the law upon the facts before it. A reference to the written statement shows that it was set out in paragraph 3 that the nomination paper was also rejected on the ground that there was no acceptance of the election agent as prescribed by law and in paragraph 4 that there was no acceptance of the election agent. It is true that the nomination paper was not also rejected on the ground that there was no acceptance of the election agent according to law and it is urged on behalf of the respondent that it is a slip for "was also liable to be rejected" and possibly it is, but we have to take it as it stands and the statement of fact is contained in the words "in as much as there was no acceptance by the Election agent as prescribed by the law". Further it is again pleaded in paragraph 4 that there was no acceptance of the election agent and in paragraph 9 that there was no acceptance of the election agent in Court. "In court" is an ambiguous and meaningless phrase as we do not know what it means. It can be construed to convey either or both of two facts, namely, that Form 5(A) had not been filed with the nomination paper or that the election agent was not present in court and did not produce it. For the purpose of the point before us both these facts are not material and we will leave them there. The fact remains that the theme of the various paragraphs of the written statement is clearly to the effect that there was no acceptance of the election agent. In paragraph 6, it is further pleaded that in any case the absence of the election agent's acceptance was fatal to the nomination paper. It was on these pleadings that issue No. 1 recited above was framed. Acceptance obviously implies acceptance in accordance with law, that is, whether it had come into existence in Form 5(A) before the delivery of the nomination paper. If we come to the conclusion that it had not, the respondent has pleaded that the defect was fatal to the nomination and it is for us to declare whether it was a non-compliance of Section 33(3) of the Act and if so how and whether it was open to the Returning Officer to reject the nomination paper on this ground as well.

After setting out the law as above, will now delve into the evidence in order to judge how far it is possible to rely on the type of oral statements made by witnesses in this case. The petitioner's case as developed by him as P. W. 2 is on the following lines:—

From 5 (A) was brought by P. W. 3 Niranjan Singh Superintendent Dharam Arth Board, of which the petitioner was the President. He could not say whether it was typed, printed or handwritten. Ex. P1 is a typed copy, but he did not have it typed. He filled up Form 5 (A) in the presence of P. Ws. 4, 5 and Sher Singh and then sent P. W. 3 with it to P. W. 6 Shri Lajpat Rai Advocate to ask him how it was to be filled up. He signed it after it had been filled up by P. W. 3 on 8th January 1954. Thereafter he sent Sher Singh to P. W. 6 again to ascertain whether it had been properly filled up. He requested Returning Officer for permission to call Sher Singh who was present outside.

The petitioner and his witnesses have contradicted themselves on various important points. The earlier portion of the petitioner's statement is to the effect that Form 5(A) was the first document which was filled up and signed by him on 8th January 1954. He stated almost immediately that it was filled up by P.W. 3 Niranjan Singh and at a later stage that he had signed it only after it had been filled up by P.W. 3. P.W. 3 Niranjan Singh stated that the nomination form and Form 5(A) were given to him by the petitioner himself, and that he was not aware who had procured them. He supported the petitioner in that he had consulted P.W. 6, as he did not know how to fill up the blanks. This means Form 5(A) was available and that he had taken blank Form 5(A) with himself when he went to P.W. 6. P.W. 6 Shri Lajpat Rai stated that P.W. 3 did not bring any Forms with him on 8th January 1954 when he came to consult him the first day. He gave details of the Forms of Nomination Paper and 5(A) after looking up the law. Next day P.W. 3 brought the printed Nomination form duly filled up and a typed copy of Form 5(A) duly filled up. Now P.W. 6 contradicts P.W. 3 who says that both the Forms were given to him by the petitioner and that he had taken both of them to P.W. 6 for consultation. P.W. 4 Joginder Singh in whose presence both the Forms are alleged to have been filled up does not state that before filling up the forms instructions had been obtained from P.W. 6. P.W. 5, Avtar Singh's statement is silent as regards the filling up of Form 5(A). P.W. 21 Bulaqa Singh, one of the most important witnesses in whose presence the Form 5(A) was filled up and who was sent to fetch Sher Singh, was produced last. In the meantime it appears an attempt was being made to patch up the weak points of the case, but it turns out to be a crude attempt, as will be pointed out presently. Bulaqa Singh's relations with the petitioner are, as admitted by him, very cordial and he has been in attendance outside the court room at every hearing and was even taking notes of his visits to a large number of persons contacted by him in order to secure support for the petitioner. He referred to one Niranjan Singh Talab who carried on business in Calcutta but wanted to stand during the elections and stated that he brought under the petitioner's instructions 3 or 4 forms out of 10 or 15 nomination forms which had been secured by Talab himself and gave one to the petitioner and retained the rest with himself. P.W. 3 had also asked him to bring a nomination form. He brought the nomination forms only and not Form 5(A). On 8th January 1954, P.W. 3 gave him a pencil draft of Form 5(A) and asked him to have it typed and then deliver it to the petitioner. Now this statement, coming as it does at the end, introduces details which were not stated either by the petitioner or P.W. 3 or in fact by any other witness. Petitioner does not state that he had ever asked P.W. 21 to bring nomination forms from Talab. According to him they had been brought by P.W. 3, though the latter stated, they had been given to him by the petitioner. Further P.W. 21 admitted that the petitioner had not told him that Form 5(A) was also required. P.W. 3 gave him a pencil draft of this Form and had asked him to have it typed. P.W. 3, however, does not support him. Who actually typed the draft in the office of the Dharm Arth Board, the witness does not remember. Where this pencil draft came from is not established on the record. P.W. 6 stated that he only gave details of the Form but did not state further that he had actually given P.W. 3, a pencil draft. P.W. 3 denies all knowledge of it and went to the office of P.W. 6 with both the Forms. P.W. 6 stated that he did not bring the Forms. Besides, it is not explained why Form 5(A) was typed when according to P.W. 1 Election Quanungo printed forms of Form 5(A) were available in the office of the Chief Electoral Officer in sufficient quantity and the stock had never fallen short. Even on the question whether the petitioner requested the Returning Officer to allow him to call Sher Singh who was sitting outside, the petitioner's statement is contradictory. After stating that he had, he has contradicted himself at the end of his statement, where he deposed that he had not done so. The statements of P.W. 13, Shri Puran Chand Advocate and P.W. 4 Joginder Singh on the point are of no value, as they go beyond the petitioner's own clear version on the point.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon Ex. P.W. 1/4 B which is an affidavit by the election agent dated 10th April 1954 affirming the correctness of the Return of Election Expenses. Obviously this document is not helpful in holding that Sher Singh had accepted his appointment on the 9th of January, 1954 when the nomination paper was filed. Along with the affidavit a return of election expenses is attached and this mentions the sum of Rs. 250/- as having been paid to Sher Singh on 8th January 1954. From this the petitioner's learned counsel wants us to conclude that Sher Singh had been appointed on that date, but we are unable to agree with him. The return of election expenses was filed up on 10th April 1954 and no conclusive test has been furnished on the record to show that the entry has not been ante-dated and that the sum of Rs. 250/- was actually paid on 8th January 1954. Besides the return of election expenses has not been proved by any one and the petitioner himself is silent. We consider, it is as much an after thought as the execution of Form 5(A).

After reviewing the entire evidence produced by the petitioner and weighing it in proper perspective, we have no hesitation in rejecting it as inconclusive, discrepant, contradictory and wholly unworthy of reliance. Petitioner's own witness, P.W. 17, Respondent No. 16 has deposed that the petitioner had told him that he had not got the acceptance Form filled up by his election Agent appears to us to be the truth. Sher Singh the election agent and the most important witness on the point has not been produced. He was summoned as a witness and even served, but did not appear and thereafter he was not summoned again. We are justified in relying on the well known presumption of law that if he had appeared, he would have deposed against the petitioner. Out of the witnesses produced by the respondent, reference may be made to the statements of R.W. 1, Sohinder Singh, Respondent No. 11 and R.W. 2 Jaswant Singh. R.W. 1, who was himself a candidate, supported P.W. 17 and deposed that it was a fact that the petitioner had stated before the Returning Officer that he had not prepared or filled the acceptance of the election Agent in Form 5(A). R.W. 2 Jaswant Singh who was a typist in the office of the Dharm Arth Board deposed that Form 5(A) was typed by him on 1st May 1954, long after the elections were over and before the filling of the election petition. Whatever be the exact date when Ex. P1 came into existence, on the above evidence, we are satisfied that the petitioner on whom lay a heavy burden has completely failed to establish that his election agent had accepted his appointment and executed his acceptance in Form 5(A) before the delivery of the nomination paper, Ex. PW 1/3 to the Returning Officer.

So far as Respondent No. 2 Sham Lal is concerned, there is not an iota of evidence to show that the election agent Som Parkash appointed by him had accepted his appointment in Form 5A before the delivery of the nomination paper.

This disposes of issue No. 1.

The next important questions which now arise are whether it was necessary to attach Form 5(A) with the nomination papers and whether the order rejecting the nomination paper of the petitioner and respondents as Form 5(A) had not been attached with the nomination papers was illegal and improper, or even malicious, *ultra vires* and without jurisdiction. Along with these, there is also the question whether the Returning Officer should have given time to the petitioner for the production of Form 5(A). These points are involved in issues No. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Since it has been held that Form 5(A) was not in existence, it is obvious that there was nothing which could be filled with Ex. PW1/3. The question still arises whether its non-existence or non-attachment was fatal to the validity of the nomination paper, as alleged by the respondent. After hearing the learned counsel at length, we are firmly of the view that the election law does not at all prescribe that the acceptance in Form 5(A) must be filed before the Returning Officer along with the nomination paper. According to Section 33(3), only the declaration of appointment of the election agent need be filed with the nomination paper. It no doubt also refers to such other declarations as may be prescribed. The other declarations are all recited in form IB (the nomination paper) and in proviso to Section 33 and Rule 5 of the Rules, but Form 5(A) is not mentioned at all. In our view acceptance in Form 5(A) is not a declaration, as it is not described in Section 40(2) of Act 43 of 1951 or in Rule 11A as a declaration, nor is Form 5(A) couched in such form as may be described as a declaration. This view was taken in 2, E.L.R. 301(311) and we respectfully agree with it. In the absence of an express provision on the point, we are unable to hold that Form 5(A) must be filed with the nomination paper and accordingly issue No. 6 does not arise. In the view taken by us, we are supported by ample authority. Reference may be made to 1, E.L.R. 211, and 2 E.L.R. 301 cited already and 6, E.L.R. 247.

3, E.L.R. 102 seems to us to go beyond the express language of Section 40, as failure to file Form 5(A) with the nomination paper cannot be held to be a non-compliance with its provisions. Besides, with all respect, we are unable to agree with the conclusion that such an omission or failure does not bring the case with Section 36(2) (d) of the Act, as it does not amount to a failure to comply with the provisions of Section 33(1) or (3). We have already expressed our view on the point in the earlier portion of this judgment. The Returning Officer rejected the nomination paper in the present case on the basis of judgment in the Barnala Case reported as 7, E. L. R., 90, but with respect we are unable to agree with the view taken in that case. It appears from the facts of the case that the PEPSSU Legislative Assembly had been dissolved by the Notification dated 4th March 1953 and the petitioner was lukewarm in the conduct of the case. He engaged no counsel and accordingly all the authorities referred to above which were

in existence and took a contrary view were not cited before the Tribunal. Accordingly we are not surprised that Form 5(A) was throughout treated as a declaration within the meaning of Section 33(3) of the Act. The learned counsel for the Respondent has not supported this judgment with any zeal. 2. E. L. R. 136 is another case which may be cited in support of the view taken by the Returning Officer, but the facts of the case show that the point was not gone into.

We have considered this important question carefully and have no hesitation in holding that the order passed by the Returning Officer rejecting the nomination paper on the ground that Form 5(A) had not been attached with the nomination paper cannot be supported, though it cannot be said to be malicious, *ultra vires* or without jurisdiction, as he had atleast the judgment in the Barnala case to support him and other cases were not shown to him. The order of the Returning Officer may however be supported on the view that has prevailed with us in the case. If the Returning Officer had adverted to the aspect which has been emphasized above and called for the acceptance of Sher Singh and Som Parkash in Form 5(A), as it was open to him to do and as he should have done under Section 36 in order to satisfy himself whether the declaration of appointment was correct, he would have found, as we have, that it was not in existence at all. Since in our view acceptance by the agent in Form 5(A) is *sine qua non* of his appointment as such, the declaration of appointment should have been held by the Returning Officer as not having been properly and validly made and the nomination paper should have been rejected by him under Section 36(2)d as a violation of Section 33(3) of the Act.

We accordingly uphold the order of the Returning Officer, though on a different ground and hold that the order rejecting the nomination paper was correct. This disposes of issues 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Only parts of issues 3 and 4 remain in connection with the question whether the order rejecting the nomination papers of the petitioner, Respondents 2 and 16 had materially affected the election. Now so far as Respondent 16 Amar Nath is concerned, he has stated as P. W. 17 that even if his nomination paper had not been rejected, he would not have fought the election. Respondent No. 2, Sham Lal has stated as P. W. 15 that if his nomination paper had not been rejected he may have been selected by his party, *i.e.* Jan Sangh and would in that case have fought the election. However, so far as the result of the election is concerned, it cannot be said to have been materially affected, as we have come to the conclusion that all the nomination papers had been rightly rejected. This question may have arisen if our conclusion on this point had been different.

The result is that the petition fails and is hereby dismissed. In the circumstances of the case, we leave the parties to bear their own costs.

The 16th April 1955.

(Sd.) KRISHNA SAHAI,

Member.

(Sd.) DALIP SINGH,

Member.

(Sd.) NAWAL KISHORE,

Chairman.

[No. 82/7/54/5192.]

By Order,

K. S. RAJAGOPALAN, Asstt. Secy.

